Case 1:11-cv-04907-AKH Document 25	Filed 01/26/12 Page 1 of 11
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
MELISSA TUCKER, et al., Plaintiffs,	
v.	11CV4907(AKH)
EAST SIDE DD LLC, et al., Defendants.	,
x	
	New York, N.Y. January 20, 2012
Before:	11:15 a.m.
HON. ALVIN K.	HELLERSTEIN
	District Judge
APPEAR	ANCES
PELTON & ASSOCIATES	
Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
BRENT PELTON TAYLOR GRAHAM NICK MAXWELL	
KASOWITZ BENSON TORRES & FRIEDMA	N
Attorneys for Defendants DANIEL TURINSKY JULIA DiPRETE	
SOUTHERN DISTRICT (212) 8	

Case 1:11-cv-04907-AKH Document 25 Filed 01/26/12 Page 2 of 11

1 (Case called)

THE COURT: I asked you in because I wanted to discuss with you a plan for going forward. We have an amended class and collective action for the plaintiffs that stands us. I don't know if it has been answered yet. It pleads a collective action under the United States laws under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Does it also plead state causes of action for a class action.

MR. PELTON: Yes, it does, your Honor; it pleads two separate class actions.

THE COURT: You need to certify this.

MR. PELTON: Yes. Plaintiffs would like to move quickly towards certification. We would like to get our initial discovery demand sent out within the next approximately ten days.

THE COURT: Have you discussed this with defendants.

MR. PELTON: We have had several calls. We prepared a proposed schedule. Plaintiffs' proposed schedule begins class certification by April 20.

THE COURT: Have you agreed on a schedule.

MR. PELTON: No, we have not.

THE COURT: Why not.

MR. PELTON: Because plaintiffs would like to get the motion filed as quickly as possible and defendants' schedule anticipates more discovery and they have a filing date of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

compilations, declarations and copies of checks, I am sorry, April 20, so long as we can get the discovery that we need.

> THE COURT: I don't think you need until April 20. Ιt

seems to me you can complete written discovery by February 10, take depositions the balance of February, and motions for certification of classes can take place March 16.

I want to give you this view as it were of my attitudes on class certifications. Contrary to what I wrote in Ansoumana v. Gristedes, I have come to the view that there is not much room for a Rule 23 class in connection with the Fair Labor Standards Act complaint. My view is that there is much more time and effort in a Rule 23 class and that that and other proceedings tend to derogate from what I have to do to implement the federal law. So, a word to the plaintiffs' lawyers, you are not likely to succeed a Rule 23 certification.

However, in the nature of pleading, your named plaintiffs have to plead all their claims in one lawsuit. They will be pleading their claims under New York labor law as well as the federal claims. So, we should get through very quickly the whole notion of certifications.

If you go along with that view, you should be on your way to substantive discovery, Mr. Pelton. I would think Mr. Turinsky would find it in his interests also to agree to certification of a federal class which would be an opt-in class without going through the labor of discovery to any great degree and both of you can get involved in merit discovery very quickly.

In any event, whatever motions you make for class

Case 1:11-cv-04907-AKH Document 25 Filed 01/26/12 Page 5 of 11 121k4tucc

certification must be made by March 16, oppositions by April 13, reply by April 24. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

THE COURT: Let me change that. March 16 for filing motions, April 20 for oppositions, and May 1 for reply. I would hope you would agree on a Section 42 opt-in class.

Tell me about the case.

MR. PELTON: Yes, your Honor. We represent three employees who work for East Side Dunkin' Donuts. East Side Dunkin' Donuts owns 28 Dunkin' Donuts franchises within Manhattan.

THE COURT: Louder.

MR. PELTON: Our clients are three former employees of Dunkin' Donuts.

THE COURT: I heard what you said.

MR. PELTON: They worked as crew members, assistant managers and managers. We have two classes of claims here, one on behalf of the assistant managers and managers which these people were required to work about 55 to 60 hours a week and were paid on an alleged salary basis.

THE COURT: Do you believe they would be entitled to overtime.

MR. PELTON: Yes, we do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you believe the managers would be entitled to overtime.

Case 1:11-cv-04907-AKH Document 25 Filed 01/26/12 Page 6 of 11

MR. PELTON: Yes, we do, because we believe that they failed the salary basis test cited.

THE COURT: Do you think there might be an inconsistency between suing for crew members and assistant managers and managers.

MR. PELTON: No, I do not, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Turinsky, is there a split in the law on managers versus assistant managers that you are going to bring on.

MR. TURINSKY: I think there is a distinction between managers and assistant managers in terms of whether or not they are exempt. That's one the factors that will go into why this shouldn't be a class in terms of the exemption status. But in terms of managers and assistant managers, yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: My view is that that may play a part when there might be a settlement discussion. I don't think it plays much of a role in terms of conflicts in Mr. Pelton's ability to represent everybody for purposes of litigation. We may in the future have to have a subclass and maybe even separate lawyers. That's something we can discuss in the future.

MR. PELTON: OK.

THE COURT: That's in opposition to class certification. I think you ought to save it, Mr. Turinsky; you make a decision on that. I am given to making these pronouncements and sometimes I change my mind. But I think

Case 1:11-cv-04907-AKH Document 25 Filed 01/26/12 Page 7 of 11 121k4tucc

it's a guide to you in terms of where you want to direct your efforts in this case.

MR. TURINSKY: Thank you, your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PELTON: The managers and assistant managers were paid on an alleged salary basis subject to deductions if they did not work the full number of hours that week.

THE COURT: You have alleged a claim against a number of East Side Dunkin' Donuts; are they all under common management.

MR. PELTON: Yes, they are.

THE COURT: The individuals that you named are the managers.

MR. PELTON: The owners and managers.

THE COURT: Why do you allege John Does.

MR. PELTON: Those are the corporate entities that we don't know their names. Each of the Dunkin' Donuts locations are set up under a separate corporate entity.

THE COURT: What you want are all the Dunkin' Donuts owned by Mr. Bronfman, Mr. Geva, and Mr. Shapiro.

MR. PELTON: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Are you able to give that, Mr. Turinsky.

MR. TURINSKY: I am sure that --

THE COURT: One way or another Mr. Pelton will get it.

MR. TURINSKY: I am sure it shouldn't be a problem identifying which Dunkin' Donuts are owned by Mr. Bronfman. I

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

Case 1:11-cv-04907-AKH Document 25 Filed 01/26/12 Page 8 of 11 121k4tucc

don't believe Mr. Shapiro is an owner. I don't believe Mr. Geva is an owner. These plaintiffs didn't work for all of those entities; they worked for a few different entities, certainly not all of them. I don't know if they are all appropriately part of this. I don't know if all of them are necessarily relevant to this case. I can certainly get information from individuals as to what --

THE COURT: You are not going to be able to make a claim, Mr. Pelton, unless you have a worker; you have three workers now.

MR. PELTON: These workers worked for the common enterprise. They worked for probably 12 to 15 of the different store locations within the enterprise. Under the Fair Labor Standards Act you look at the overall enterprise or business.

THE COURT: In my view, Mr. Turinsky, you should give the information. We can work out later who should be a proper defendant.

MR. TURINSKY: I appreciate that.

THE COURT: What else.

MR. PELTON: The store managers were paid on a salary basis, the assistant managers also on the alleged salary basis. Their job duties we do not believe meet any of the executive exemptions, so these people would be exempt.

THE COURT: You need to exchange all the relevant documents that Mr. Turinsky's clients have.

Case 1:11-cv-04907-AKH Document 25 Filed 01/26/12 Page 9 of 11 121k4tucc

I learned this from the late Judge Milton Pollack. Interrogatories and Rule 34 requests are largely a waste of time. Each should give your files, holding back whatever is privileged. You've got manuals, Mr. Turinsky, you've got pay records, you've got job descriptions, other things that are important to you case, the sooner you give it, the less trouble, the sooner we can get into the merits and save your client a great deal of money. You know what is relevant, both of you, just do it. You don't need Rule 34 requests. Just exchange your files. Pick a date it's convenient. Do it.

MR. PELTON: The crew member class has claims for unpaid overtime which involved shaving of hours and shifting of hours from one week to the next. They also have spread of hours claims under labor New York labor law and they have the gratuity claim.

THE COURT: What is spread of hours.

MR. PELTON: Under New York labor law, if you work a split shift or more than 10 hours on any day, you are entitled to an extra hour at minimum wage for that 10-hour day.

THE COURT: What is a split shift; if you work on the tail end of one shift it comes into the next shift.

MR. PELTON: Say you work from 6 until 10 then from 2 until 4. They also have the gratuity claim. Each of the Dunkin' Donuts locations had a tip cup where customers put change and dollar bills in the tip cup. Contrary to what

Case 1:11-cv-04907-AKH Document 25 Filed 01/26/12 Page 10 of 11 121k4tucc

DD's bank account and at the end of the week, the full-time employees would receive \$20, the part-time employees would receive \$5.

THE COURT: All of this alleged in the complaint.

MR. PELTON: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I got the picture.

MR. TURINSKY: That's an accurate recitation of the allegations in the complaint. We certainly deny that employees were not properly paid overtime.

THE COURT: I assume.

MR. TURINSKY: We certainly deny the allegations. We certainly do not think this is an appropriate class.

THE COURT: It's an appropriate Section 42 claim.

MR. TURINSKY: I was referring to the Rule 23 class.

THE COURT: You are likely to win on that issue.

MR. TURINSKY: Unless your Honor has any specific questions, I think your Honor understands.

THE COURT: The spread of hours will be an issue for individual claims not for the class.

MR. TURINSKY: I think that's correct.

THE COURT: OK. If there are disputes, see Rule 2(e) in my individual rules which requires a joint letter putting the dispute before me and I will give you a pretty quick turn-around on resolving the dispute.

Case 1:11-cv-04907-AKH Document 25 Filed 01/26/12 Page 11 of 11